

REMARKS

Interview Summary

The Applicants' representative (the undersigned) and the Examiner conducted a telephonic interview on October 8, 2009 at approximately 3:00 PM, Eastern Standard Time. As noted in the above-incorporated Examiner's Interview Summary, several of the pending claims were discussed and the Examiner and the undersigned discussed proposed claim amendments (*i.e.*, specific definitional claim language) that would render the claims allowable in view of the Examiner. Specifically, Claims 3-8, 10, 15, 18-20, 22-27, 34-35, 46-51, 55-56, 60-61, and 66-67 were discussed. Agreement was reached regarding precise claim language that would place the claims into allowable condition. The Examiner indicated that claims that included specific suggested claim language (either by amending pending claims, or in some cases, for some specific discussed claims, without amendment) would be rendered allowable after Applicants submitted a formal amendment. The specific claim language indicated by the Examiner that render existing and amended claims allowable included the following terms: "capacitive coupling", "capacitively coupled", "capacitively coupling", "coupled capacitively", and the like. The Examiner indicated that claims including this definitional language, or amended to include such definitional language, would allowable.

More specifically, the "Listing of Claims – Summary of Proposed Amendments" set forth on pages 2-17 above reflect the claim amendments that were discussed with and suggested by the Examiner that would render the amended claims allowable in the Examiner's opinion. This summary of proposed amendments also includes a listing of pending claims that were considered to be allowable by the Examiner without amendment because the suggested definitional claim language is already present in the non-amended pending claims. The Examiner indicated that claims would be allowable (or rendered allowable in the case of claim amendments) that included the definitional "capacitive coupling" terms or similar language. For example, Claims 1-2 were proposed to be cancelled, while Claims 3-6 were proposed to be amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of these proposed cancelled claims, and to include the term "capacitive coupling circuitry". The Examiner indicated that the proposed claims would be allowable if they presently included or were amended to include the "capacitive coupling" definitional claim language described above. Many of the other discussed claims were proposed to be similarly amended to include the term "capacitive coupling", "capacitive coupling circuitry", "capacitive coupling circuits" (for apparatus claims) or "capacitively coupled" and "coupled capacitively" (for method claims). For example, see the proposed discussed amendments to Claims 10 (proposed to be amended to include the term "capacitively coupling"), 18 (proposed to be amended to include the term "coupled capacitively", as opposed to "coupled passively"), and 49 (proposed to be amended to include the term "capacitively coupled", as opposed to "passively coupled"). With the caveat that

some of the following claims would need to be amended in independent form because they would depend from a proposed cancelled claim, the Examiner indicated that the following claims would be allowable as pending (*i.e.*, either no amendment was necessary to render the claim allowable, or the claim only needed to be amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of a proposed cancelled claim) because they already included the definitional claim language described above: Claims 5-6, 15, 24-27, 34-35, 46, 55-56, 60-61, and 66-67. The Examiner indicated that the following claims would be rendered allowable if amended to include the agreed upon definitional claim language (and in some cases amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of a proposed cancelled claim): 3-4, 10, 18, and 49-51. The Examiner also noted that the claims depending from these claims that would be rendered allowable by amendment, or considered allowable because the discussed definitional language is already present in the pending claim, would also be rendered allowable. For example, dependent Claims 62-65 would now be considered allowable due to their dependency (either directly or indirectly) on allowable claims.

No new matter would be added by the proposed amendment when it is submitted in due course by the Applicants. Support for these amendments will be set forth in the formal amendment. Support for these amendments will be found throughout the subject application, and in the claims as originally filed.

No exhibits were shown or demonstrated to the Examiner during the interview. No specific prior art was discussed, although the Examiner indicated that the above described definitional language would render the claims allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

The foregoing remarks summarize the content of an interview between the Examiner and the undersigned taking place on October 8, 2009. The Commissioner is authorized to construe this paper as including a petition to extend the deadline for this Summary by the number of months necessary to make this paper timely filed. Fees or deficiencies required to cause the response to be complete and timely filed may be charged, and any overpayments should be credited, to our Deposit Account No. **50-0490**.

A formal amendment will be submitted by the Applicants in due course. The Examiner is requested to review and consider the summary of the interview set forth above, and confirm the accuracy of same. The Examiner is also requested to review the proposed claim amendments set forth above, and to suggest any further revisions that will expedite the allowance of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,

November 9, 2009

Date: November 9, 2009

JAQUEZ & ASSOCIATES
6265 Greenwich Drive, Suite 100D
San Diego, California 92122-5916
(858) 453-2004 (TEL)
(858) 453-1280 (FAX)


Martin J. Jaquez
Registration No. 38,060